EOU FACULTY SENATE
12-5-17
INLOW 201

Senators:

Daysi Bedolla

Cori Brewster

Shaun Cain

Joe Corsini

Ryan Dearinger

Dwight Denman

Teresa Farrell

Theresa Gillis

Bill Grigsby

Nicole Howard

Nancy Knowles

John Knutson-Martin

Scott McConnell

Lee Ann McNerney

Michael O'Connor

Brian Sather

Michael Sell

Emily Sharratt

Amy Yielding

Guests: Chris Burford, Kevin Walker, Donald Wolff, Gary Keller, Michael Fields, Peter Geissinger, Nathan Lowe, Danny Mielke, Jeff Carman, Rae Ette Newman, Luke Aldrich, Lacy Karpilo, Anita Harris, Wilson Zehr

NK	Call to order	● Meeting called to order at 3:19 PM	
	Agenda Review	● We might pull off some consent agenda items ● No other changes	
	Approval of Minutes	● JC Moved to approve ● ES seconds ● Motion passes, minutes approved	
Donald Wolff	Provost Report	● Presenting draft of expectations ● We've always had memo regarding use of Canvas 　○ Important to document student progress and success 　○ Retention and completion 　○ Closing achievement gap	

		- When there's a wide discrepancy between faculty using or not using Canvas, it tends to confuse students, esp. 1st year students and transfers - Students track progress - Assist when grievances arise - Give FS a heads up that this will go out to colleges for discussion and feedback - NK - what is timeline regarding this? - DW - Deans will bring it up at college mtgs in winter - CB - I've heard widespread concern about this draft, some sweeping implications and unintended consequences EOU didn't anticipate - CB - if there is support, I would move we create ad hoc committee to draft response to bring back to next FS meeting ==CB moves that FS craft response== ==JC seconds motion== - JC - I think chairs council could craft response - CB - I'd like sentate to have draft of our own. Senators are elected, chairs are not. Chairs play a different role and exist outside shared gov. - JC - main reason is not to have redundancy - NH - CASSH hasn't discussed this yet, on agenda for tomorrow's meeting. Not clear if college council will address this. If 3 or 4 people reached out to me about concerns, and I have concerns as well. This MOE differs from last 8 I researched in both tone and substance that I find troubling. - Motion passes, 1 abstention - Amy, Cori, Nicole, Joe volunteer to draft response	
	EPCC Consent agenda	- Changes to MBA program removed from consent agenda - NH moves to approve remaining consent agenda - SM seconds - Motion passes 1 abstention	
	MBA Program Changes	- Changes are substantial and have been in the works for a long time. - SM - I was involved earlier on. Intention to move program toward reflecting current marketplace. Addition of some courses, looking at different materials. This is updating what it means to be an MBA program. - Kevin Walker - MBA prog as it exists right now dates back to the 1980s and 90s. Extending students to advanced degree of thought in existing cores: marketing, finance, etc. This is not a sustainable model in modern era. Program isn't advanced enough; lots of repeating undergraduate material. More modern MBA material assumes students have common core competencies.	

Require all incoming students have met core competencies.
- ○ Changes have been in the works for more than 2 years now.
- ○ Address where modern business thought is going.
- ○ Credit hours for courses from 5 to 3. Old courses had 2 credit labs attached to 3-credit courses.
- ○ OUS system changes eliminated lab courses, but kept 5 credits per course.
- ○ Most programs have gone to core series of courses with electives.
- ○ Allowing PSU courses to substitute into our new program.
- ○ Original OUS approval included overload. Still taught as overload.
- <mark>JC moves to approve MBA changes</mark>
- <mark>ES seconds</mark>
- CB - I voted against this proposal because we were being asked to make a decision without enough information. Overload issue is particularly important. We don't need to just defer to deans or admin approval. Raises questions about load for faculty when floated as overload. Teaching quality, discipline research, etc. FS and EPCC role is to question whether something liket his is good for EOU. What is the institutional commitment to this? Hard to think that perpetual overload is good for EOU.
- Wilson - sounds like this has been working if courses are taught on overload.
- CB - but doing what we've always done if it's a bad idea to begin with isn't good practice. They've demonstrated there's a need, at what point to we commit to staffing the program?
- Dan Mielke - Our program has been around since 2005. Gone through external accreditation twice and have fully approved our program, how we run it, and that it is successful.
- CB - All I'm saying is that it's our responsibility to ask questions about this particular structure. It's a criteria to consider on principle. Not questioning the quality.
- DM - but you're questioning the quality of the program based on the structure of how it's delivered.
- CB - At this point, I'm asking a question I asked at EPCC.
- CB - SEcond issue is the relationship with PSU. Some specialities within this MBA that can only be earned via PSU courses.
- KW - that isn't true.
- CB - there is an MOU with PSU that sets expectations. At what point do we have access to relationships regarding curriculum with other institutions? We aren't just evaluating what is beign offered at EOU, but at another

		institution.
		● Rae Ette - Comment on checksheet has been formally changed. "Substitutions can happen."
		● DM - Comment on relationship with PSU: recently had opportunity to expand offerings from site in Tigard. Talk to PSU about how they felt about that, and they love that EOU could do that, and they wanted to be involved. PSU is offering EOU students access to 3 certificate programs within their School of Business.
		● BS - If program is offered only via overload, at any moment faculty could decide to stop teaching it.
		● JC - Might be that Business accreditation might not worry about course offerings via overload, but a few years back EOU came under scrutiny from accreditors for teaching too much overload.
		    ○ Contractually we have language (with senior instructor II level) that says someone teaching for 3 years mgmt and union have to come together to approve line into full-track line.
		    ○ Staffing issues concern FS at some level, and it should concern EOU as a whole. We should deal with staffing issues through the union. I support the curriculum here but figure out staffing through negotiations and the union.
		● SM - these are important issues that have been raised by business faculty themselves. This doesn't change how the current program is staffed or structured. This might be a bigger problem with regards to staffing. If it fails here, we still have a program that is tenuous.
		● NH - was MFA program taught as overload?
		● NK - language associated with changing tracks or overload to full time.
		● RD - Ridiculous how overload is sorted differently between colleges. What's the baseline?
		● DB - are the learning outcomes changing?
		● KW - changing outcomes to what is in the paperwork.
		● CB - I've heard this program is a cash cow for EOU. How much money is it making us? And what is the reasoning for not staffing it with dedicated faculty teaching it in load?
		● WZ - we have the same questions. We'd love to reinvest in the program as well.
		● NK - My concern is HR language regarding "sufficient personnel" when it comes to accreditation. We should revisit.
		● <mark>Motion passes, 3 abstentions</mark>	

	IFS Alternate position	● We need to fill position being vacated by Steve Tanner. Nominations? ● CB - I nominate myself. ● <mark>CB approved by acclamation</mark>	

| | BOT Recommendations for board members | We have 4 nominees and can accept additional nominees Email secretary Michael Sell with votes DB - other statements from nominees? NK - we didn't ask for statements and we won't' hold that against anyone who didn't provide statements Burford - wasn't sure whether we'd take up the discussion of process before or after voting. NK - we should do that beforehand. Last time we referred that directly to governor. At last FS meeting there was strong support for doing the same this year. Burford - I wonder what FS sees as the purpose in doing that. Some negatives doing it that way. But why does FS think that's a good approach. BG - last time around we did a faculty-wide vote. Last time person with most votes was not recommended for the position. This is our only opportunity for faculty representation. We want to make a strong statement about the person we feel would best represent faculty on the BOT. For instance, statement on reports of self-eval, I'm not happy that the process almost "puts" the lone faculty member. We should have control over who that person is. Burford - Just focusing on sending info from FS to governor directly rather than send it along with other nominations or recommendations. NH - Recommendations can come in from anywhere. Appropriate channel for FS to send it along directly. Burford - This isn't an independent body, it's part of a university. Other apps are being coordinated and sent up to governor from our office. What's the recommendation? I think a recommendation is made when FS selects someone, so I'm not sure what purpose is served. AY - I don't see how it does any wrong at all. Burford - I think it matters only in a small way of what it says about the University and how it works as a team. Does that require a lot of our time? No, but wanted to know reasons from FS. I would still recommend that when FS makes its vote, you let me know and we can send it along. NK - Would you like me to send recommendation directly to governor's office? ==AY - I move that our recommendation for FS BOT nominee go directly to governor's office.== ==CB - seconds== ==Motion passes, no abstentions== CB - Send one name as recommendation. Sends clear message. ==Vote result: Shaun Cain== | |

BG	Course Eval Committee Update	● Response rate a little higher. 41%. 56% of students didn't' do anything. ● I think we can require students to do something. They can opt out or decline, but it's a response. ● Some courses didn't receive the EvalKit in Canvas shell. IT is trying to figure out why that is. We don't know how many, but they're not in the response report, so the report is accurate. ● I think it's safe to say that students have to do something. They either respond or decline to respond. ● AY - have you thought about how you'd "force" students to participate? They still need to go through something to decline to respond. ● BG - Not sure. No contingency for courses not using Canvas. ● NK - We should approve the current course eval if people like it so that piece is done. Still treated as a pilot? Still fiddle with form to address comments or should we use what we have? ● BG - We don't know differentiation between students and responses. ● TF - Has EOU used format for not accessing grades before evals?	
NK	<mark>Delays</mark>	● <mark>Delaying Freedom of Expression statement</mark> ● <mark>Delaying CTLA discussion</mark> ● <mark>Delaying Constitutional Review Committee Report</mark>	
Jeff Carman	IT Report	● Recommendation: Bring Your Own Device 　○ How to provide financial aid to students in need for digital device 　○ Also worked with vendors to provide Microsoft devices for students ● Recommendation: Podium in Smart classrooms ● Recommendation: Professional development for faculty 　○ Any new technology adopted, there has to be pro development ● TG - does bring your own device mean smartphone? ● JC - not recommended to use smartphones. Surface Pro tablets should suffice.	
	Pierce Lib Renaming	*From notes taken by N. Knowles* ● Students have tried this before ● It's a sensitivity issue 　○ Student Council for Multicultural Affairs - if EOU is going to promote, we want campus to be safe ● The editor of *The Voice* wrote and article and started petition for name change. ● Walter Pierce 　○ was not involved with KKK,	

| | | but research/interviews show he was. He would accept endorsements. If we're going to be a university that advertises diversity, we should not have to walk into a library named after someone who opposed minority groups. Student Affairs delayed approval of a student survey. Survey results would move to petition.
Appropriately weigh information Stand for fairness Looking for integrity of process The survey is not useful because the answer is expected His name is not on the building Have the conversations outside the institution Objections from community? Politicians make moral compromises Pierce's language was that we shouldn't sell land to non-whites. His contact with racists was not casual; he was a nativist. His political opponent disagreed. Student survey in the community 80% of people didn't know who he was Public meeting about what to rename, not to change name? Nomination process. This is a university issue ==NH moves Faculty senate resolution affirms desire to see name of library changed through a deliberative process== ==MO seconds== Research: compile Pierce's words so we can read it. We need to have a package of information Library working on a package on the name There is student work to back this up, we can find it Burden or persuasion should be on people making request for the change Premature to make a decision before you have the reasons Assessment of the evidence is coming from trusted faculty members Department of this institution responsible for public information This does not reflect that the body has considered the information ==Motion passes, one abstention== | |
| Tim Seydel | 2029 Endow ment campai gn | ==Delayed until next meeting== | |

		Meeting adjourned. Next meeting January 16, 2018	

Minutes prepared by Michael Sell, 12-5-17
Minutes finalized by Michael Sell 1-12-18

KEY

Motions + Seconds

Motion passes/Vote approval

Motion rejected/Vote failed

Changes or notifications